PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:

see form PCT/ISA/220

6/10

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43*bis*.1)

Date of mailing *(day/month/year)* see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)	
Applicant's or agent's file reference see form PCT/ISA/220	**FOR FURTHER ACTION** See paragraph 2 below
International application No. PCT/IB2005/050910	International filing date *(day/month/year)* 15.03.2005
	Priority date *(day/month/year)* 26.03.2004
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC G06F1/00	
Applicant KONINKLIJKE PHILIPS ELECTRONICS N.V.	

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☐ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43*bis*.1(á)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. **FURTHER ACTION**

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notifed the International Bureau under Rule 66.1*bis*(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA:

European Patent Office
D-80298 Munich
Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d
Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465

Authorized Officer

Kerschbaumer, J

Telephone No. +49 89 2399-2999.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.
PCT/IB2005/050910

Box No. I Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

   ☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).

2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:

   a. type of material:

   ☐ a sequence listing

   ☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing

   b. format of material:

   ☐ in written format

   ☐ in computer readable form

   c. time of filing/furnishing:

   ☐ contained in the international application as filed.

   ☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.

   ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.

3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.

4. Additional comments:

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43*bis*.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Yes:	Claims	
	No:	Claims	1, 16, 30, 31, 32
Inventive step (IS)	Yes:	Claims	
	No:	Claims	2-15, 17-29
Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes:	Claims	1-32
	No:	Claims	

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

Re Item V

1 The following document is referred to in this communication; the numbering will be adhered to in the rest of the procedure:

D1: US 2003/076955 A1 (ALVE JUKKA ET AL) 24 April 2003 (2003-04-24)

2 Independent claim 1 does not meet the requirements of Article 33(2) PCT, because the subject-matter of the claim is not new.
Document D1 discloses the subject matter of Independent claim 1 as follows:

Claim 1	**D1**
A method of generating an Authorized Domain (AD), the method comprising the steps of	"Authorized domains are groups of authorized devices owned by a user." par. 19
selecting a domain identifier (Domain_ID) uniquely identifying the Authorized Domain	"The domain key is a key shared by all the devices in an authorized domain." par. 44 and Fig. 5 Remark: The use of an identifier (ID) to identify a key is implicit.
binding at least one user to the domain identifier	"... devices owned by a user." par. 19 Remark: The "owned by a user" binds the user to the domain

binding at least one device to at least one user	"A user's compliant devices, or a family's compliant devices, can be organized into an authorized domain" par. 4 "... devices owned by a user." par. 19 Remark: The "devices owned by a user" binds the device to the user by being owned. Shared ownership is known in families.
thereby obtaining a number of devices and a number of users that is authorized to access a content item of said Authorized Domain	"The inclusion of authorized domains ... to limit users' freedom to use their content." par. 19

3 Independent claims 16, 30, 31 and 32 substantially correspond to claim 1. Therefore the same objection regarding lack of novelty as above also applies correspondingly to these independent claims (Article 33(2) PCT).

4 The additional features of dependent claims appear to be either known from D1 or usually applied methods in the field of DRM and, consequently, do not lead to an inventive subject matter (Article 33 PCT).